

Serial No. 09/971,892  
Page 12

REMARKS

In the Office Action of August 25, 2004, the Examiner has objected to the drawings for noted informalities. The disclosure is objected to for stated informalities. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention, in that the claim improperly depends from itself. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Chauhan et al US Publication 2003/0004909.

The Office Action of August 25, 2004, has been carefully considered and by this amendment, entry of which is respectfully requested, claims 1-18 remain in the application; claim 8 has been amended. The amendment does not add new matter.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings for noted informalities, requiring correction. The correction of the informalities has been made with amendments to the specifications, and amendments to the drawings are not proposed.

The objections to the disclosure have been noted, and appropriate amendments are submitted herein.

With respect to the rejection of claim 8 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, claim 8 has been amended herein to properly depend from independent claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that claim 8 now complies with 35 USC 112.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 USC §102(e), for the reason that the cited art does not teach, anticipate, or render obvious the invention of Applicant, as now claimed.

The test for determining if a cited document

Serial No. 09/971,892  
Page 13

anticipates a claim, for purposes of a rejection under 35 USC §102, is whether the cited document discloses all of the elements of the claimed combination, or the mechanical equivalents, functioning in substantially the same way to produce substantially the same results. As noted by the Court of Appeals of the Federal Circuit in Lindemann Maschinenfabrick GmbH v. American Hoist and Derrick, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (1984), in evaluating the sufficiency of an anticipation rejection under 35 USC §102:

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim."

In considering the Chauhan et al document cited by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that this document does not anticipate the subject invention. The Chauhan document is directed to a method and system for managing knowledge; whereas the present invention is directed to a system and method for *guiding a user*. Hence, while the Chauhan et al reference has a "Conversation Manager", the conversation consists of *users posing questions to experts*. This is quite the opposite of the present invention, wherein *questions are posed to users*. Claim 1 of Chauhan, as well as the description of Chauhan, require users to submit questions, and finding experts to answer the questions, so that information is provided to the user based on questions asked by the user. The present invention requires users to answer questions, and information is provided to the user based on questions answered by the user.

The Chauhan reference does not in any way claim

Serial No. 09/971,892  
Page 14

a series of guidance questions for the user. Chauhan specifically states that the distributed knowledge base requires users to pose queries to experts. The Chauhan reference does not teach or suggest knowledge and tools for task guidance question and answer choices. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that independent claims 1 and 12 of the subject application are not anticipated by the cited document.

In light of the amendments and remarks herein, it is respectfully suggested that all of the claims of the subject application disclose patentable subject matter, which subject matter is not anticipated or obviated by the cited documents, taken singularly or in combination, since the cited documents fail to disclose the elements of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim, with the purpose defined in the subject application.

Claims 2-11 and 13-18 depend from independent claims 1 or 12 to contain all of the limitations found therein. By this dependency, it is submitted that these claims are not anticipated, taught, or rendered obvious by the cited document. Additionally, these claims add further limitations which distinguish them patentably from the cited documents. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of all of the claims of the application is respectfully requested.


Applicants' attorney has reviewed the additional art cited by but not relied upon by the Examiner. Those documents do not teach, anticipate, or render obvious, when taken singularly or in any combination, the invention of applicants disclosed in the subject application.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the undersigned attorney respectfully submits that all of the

Serial No. 09/971,892  
Page 15

claims of the application are clearly allowable. Therefore, Applicant's attorney respectfully requests that the Examiner's objections and rejections be withdrawn and that a formal Notice of Allowance be issued thereon.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Barbara Joan Haushalter  
Registration No. 33,598

228 Bent Pines Court  
Bellefontaine, Ohio 43311  
(937) 592-8603  
Facsimile: (937) 592-8604  
January 25, 2005